

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/938,435	08/23/2001	Tae Kyung Won	5336/DISPLAY/AKT/BG 2581		
APPLIED MATERIALS, INC. 2881 SCOTT BLVD. M/S 2061			EXAMINER JACKSON, MONIQUE R		
SANTA CLA	RA, CA 95050		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1773		
			DATE MAILED: 09/29/2003	DATE MAILED: 09/29/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			17			
	Application N .	Applicant(s)				
	09/938,435	WON ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	- 10			
	Monique R Jackson	1773				
The MAILING DATE of this communicati n app Period for Reply	pears on the c ver sheet with the c	rrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute. - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 A	<u> August 2003</u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ Th	is action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowed in appearance with the practice under						
closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1955 C.D. 11, 4	53 U.G. 213.				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13 and 25-38</u> is/are pending in the	application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13 and 25-38</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acception acception acception acception to the	, ,					
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on		` ·				
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep		Tod by the Examinor.				
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•				
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic			n).			
a) The translation of the foreign language pro	* *		•			
Attachment(s)	-					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal F	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 04-01) Application/Control Number: 09/938,435 Page 2

Art Unit: 1773

DETAILED ACTION

1. It is noted that the instant application has been reassigned to Examiner Monique R. Jackson; contact information is provided below. Upon reconsideration, the finality of the prior office action dated 4/24/03 has been withdrawn. Any inconvenience to the Applicant is regretted.

- 2. The after-final amendment filed 8/25/03 has been entered. The after-final amendment faxed 9/9/03 has been entered. Claims 1-13 and 25-38 are pending in the application.
- 3. The Examiner notes that the Applicant submitted the after-final amendment faxed 9/9/03 to place the application in condition for allowance based on a conversation with the Examiner, however after upon reconsideration, the Examiner has reopened prosecution in light of the following rejections.
- 4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 5. Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 3-6 recite the limitation "the organosilicate film" in lines 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- 6. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "thin organosilicate film" in claims 8-9 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "thin" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not

Application/Control Number: 09/938,435 Page 3

Art Unit: 1773

provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Is "thin" on the order of tens of microns, a few microns, thousands of angstroms, hundreds of angstroms?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. Claims 1-13 and 25-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goto et al in view of Beer et al. Goto et al teach deposition of TEOS oxide using pulsed RF plasma wherein a TEOS precursor is deposited on a silicon dioxide substrate using a PECVD process to produce an organosilicate film on the substrate such that the thickness uniformity of the film is less than 10% (Col. 5, lines 15-30; Tables 1-2; Fig. 6b.) Goto et al teach that the process of making the coated substrate includes inputting He, Oxygen and TEOS into a PECVD chamber and applying RF energy to generate a plasma utilizing standard TEOS conditions wherein He is supplied at 100 sccm, Oxygen at 350 sccm, and TEOS at 185 sccm, at a temperature of 400°C (Col. 5; Examples.)
- 8. Though Goto et al teach that uniformity of the film thickness is critical, Goto et al do not teach controlling the surface temperature of the substrate at two points, namely a perimeter area and an inner area inside the perimeter, as instantly claimed, in order to control thickness uniformity. However, as previously discussed in prior office actions and noted on the record by the Applicant, substrate temperature variations in a CVD process affect the film thickness and uniformity of an organosilicate film that is formed from such process wherein a more uniform temperature on the entire substrate surface yields a more uniform thickness of the coated layer. Hence, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to maintain a uniform temperature distribution across the entire surface of the

Art Unit: 1773

substrate to be coated in the invention taught by Goto et al. Further, as previously discussed,
Beer et al disclose a method which comprises controlling the temperature of the periphery of a
substrate and an inside portion thereof in order to produce a uniform temperature across the
substrate in a PECVD processing chamber, wherein the Examiner notes that uniform temperature
promotes uniform thickness as previously discussed. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the
art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to control the temperature difference
at a periphery portion and an inner portion of the substrate as taught by Beer et al in order to
obtain a uniform temperature on the entire substrate surface ensuring a uniform film thickness in
the invention taught by Goto et al, utilizing routine experimentation to determine the optimum
operating conditions including input feeds, operating temperatures, deposition time/rate and
energy density to provide the desired film and thickness properties for a particular end use.
Further, though Goto et al do not teach the length and width of the substrate to be coated, it
would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to determine the desired substrate
size based on a particular end use.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Wong et al (USPN 5,156,820) teaches a reaction chamber with controlled radiant energy heating and distributed reactant flow in order to maintain a uniform temperature on the substrate surface in order to ensure uniform film growth on the substrate.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monique R Jackson whose telephone number is 703-308-0428. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Thursdays, 8:00AM-4:30PM.

Application/Control Number: 09/938,435

Art Unit: 1773

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul J Thibodeau can be reached on 703-308-2367. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

MONIQUE R. JACKSON PRIMARY EXAMINER

Technology Center 1700 September 23, 2003